

EXHIBIT C

Sonoda, Jason K.

From: Andrew W Spangler [spangler@spanglerlawpc.com]
Sent: Friday, February 29, 2008 9:53 AM
To: Michael Sacksteder; shejny@mckoolsmith.com
Cc: tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com; Sonoda, Jason K.; David Hayes; Todd Gregorian; dsochia@McKoolSmith.com; jbindler@McKoolSmith.com; Andrew W Spangler
Subject: RE: SAP v. i2

Michael,

A couple of things. I have been talking with my team and client here. What you request comes as a real surprise and we simply can't make that decisions so quickly. We really think this is something that should be thought through and discussed between the parties more thoroughly. However, I am sensitive to the deadline tomorrow (no comment on it being a Saturday). So that the parties have time to discuss this, we will not oppose a request to extend the deadline by two weeks.

As to your schedule proposal, keep in mind that (1) we don't know what patent you are talking about and (2) 45 days is far shorter than what the patent rules contemplate. Typically a defendant has time from the service of the patent to the deadline you propose to search for prior art and develop its contentions. This typically is a four-six month time frame. Under your proposal, i2 would only have a month and a half to search for prior are and develop its contentions. While the process may be easier for you as the patents have been in your possession and you have discovery related to our products, it is not a fair process and schedule for i2. This is why I believe the parties should discuss this further.

Let me know if you are amendable to having the two week deadline and discussing this over the next week or two.

Regards,
Andrew Spangler

From: Michael Sacksteder [mailto:MSacksteder@Fenwick.com]
Sent: Friday, February 29, 2008 11:48 AM
To: Andrew W Spangler; shejny@mckoolsmith.com
Cc: tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com; jasonsonoda@paulhastings.com; David Hayes; Todd Gregorian; dsochia@McKoolSmith.com; jbindler@McKoolSmith.com
Subject: RE: SAP v. i2

Andrew,

SAP would be willing to work with i2 concerning a reasonable adjustment to the schedule to enable the parties to comply with their obligations under the patent local rules in an efficient manner. SAP proposes treating today's date as having the patent local rules effect of the CMC date for the added patent. In other words, SAP's preliminary infringement contentions as to that patent would be due ten court days from today, i2's preliminary invalidity contentions would be due 45 calendar days after that, and so on. We could make this proposed revision to the schedule part of a stipulation concerning the amended complaint.

Please let me know whether this is acceptable to i2.

Regards,

3/17/2008

Mike

Michael J. Sacksteder
Fenwick & West LLP
555 California Street, 12th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 875-2450
msacksteder@fenwick.com

From: Andrew W Spangler [mailto:spangler@spanglerlawpc.com]
Sent: Friday, February 29, 2008 9:08 AM
To: Michael Sacksteder; shejny@mckoolsmith.com
Cc: tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com; jasonsonoda@paulhastings.com; David Hayes; Todd Gregorian; dsochia@McKoolSmith.com; jbindler@McKoolSmith.com; Andrew W Spangler
Subject: RE: SAP v. i2

Michael,

I just sent an email to Todd on this issue. As I explained to Todd, we have real concerns about adding a new patent at this stage as we are already into the Markman process, contentions would have to be done, we would be entitled to have time to search for prior art and do discovery etc. That is a lot of work and will required a lot time. Before we could give you an answer on your request we would need more information from you on how you intend to accomplish all of this under the current schedule.

I am generally free all day today and can discuss this with you. I already had carved out time for a 4:00 CST meet and confer with Todd so if you would like to have the call then, that would be fine. Just send around a call-in number.

Regards,
Andrew Spangler

From: Michael Sacksteder [mailto:MSacksteder@Fenwick.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2008 10:48 AM
To: shejny@mckoolsmith.com
Cc: tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com; jasonsonoda@paulhastings.com; Andrew W Spangler; David Hayes
Subject: SAP v. i2

Scott,

As you know, the deadline for amendments to the pleadings in the California SAP v. i2 litigation is March 1, 2008. Before that date, SAP intends to seek leave to amend its complaint to assert an additional cause of action for infringement by i2 of one additional SAP patent. Please let me know whether i2 would be willing to stipulate to such an amendment, or whether a motion will be necessary. If you would like to discuss this with me, please call my mobile phone at 650-248-8944. I will be in the air for part of the day, but will be available again around 5 p.m. CDT.

Thanks.

Regards,

Mike

Michael J. Sacksteder

3/17/2008

Fenwick & West LLP
555 California Street, 12th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 875-2450
msacksteder@fenwick.com

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice in this communication (including attachments) is not intended or written by Fenwick & West LLP to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

ATTENTION:

The information contained in this message may be legally privileged and confidential. It is intended to be read only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed or by their designee. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are on notice that any distribution of this message, in any form, is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and/or Fenwick & West LLP by telephone at (650) 988-8500 and delete or destroy any copy of this message.

3/17/2008